

## WILL CUTS OFF WIDOW, AND SHE WILL FIGHT IT

Document Leaves Estate of \$100,000 to Virgilio Del Genovese's Brother.

## DAUGHTER LEFT OUT.

Relatives of Dead Contractor Assert That Woman Was Not Married to Him.

When the will of Virgilio Del Genovese, an Italian contractor, was read, it was found that he had left an estate valued close to \$100,000. It was produced before Surrogate Church in Brooklyn today, two brothers and sisters of the dead man were thrown into consternation. They were not aware that their brother had left a will bequeathing all to a brother, Giuseppe. Up to this period they were willing to contest the document. The last testament of Del Genovese was in the hands of the brother who was named as the sole beneficiary.

While debating the method of proceeding, a heavily veiled woman and a sixteen-year-old girl entered the courtroom, accompanied by Lawyer Harry E. Lewis. She announced that she was the widow of Del Genovese, and was entitled to her husband's property. She told the court that she was Mrs. Sidonia Del Genovese, of Montgomery street, and One Hundred and Seventy-seventh street, the Bronx, and that it was at her home that Genovese had died.

## Abandoned the Contest.

Upon this strange statement, the two brothers and two sisters, who had expected to share in the dead brother's estate, left the courtroom, and said they would not further contest the will.

Mrs. Del Genovese and the dead man's brother, Giuseppe, who produces the mysterious will, were unable to agree. The brother told the man's widow that he could show that she had a husband when she married her brother by a ceremony which was performed by Alderman Donovan four years after the will is supposed to have been made in favor of the brother, Giuseppe.

As nearly as could be learned Del Genovese met the woman in 1888. At that time she admitted she was the wife of Edward Lopez, a man who had been married shortly after, and Lopez, according to the woman, left her, saying that she was free to marry again, and that he would never return to bother her. The deserted wife did not see Lopez again until she learned that her husband had died.

## Married the Contractor.

She then married Del Genovese, the ceremony being recorded. The fruit of the marriage, the sixteen-year-old girl who accompanied her mother into court.

When Mrs. Del Genovese announced her intention of contesting the will, Giuseppe arose and dramatically said: "I can produce Lopez, who is still married to that man. You have no right to the property of my dead brother."

The declaration caused a stir in court. Mrs. Del Genovese was partly overcome by the exhibition of the will. After this announcement she broke down and wept bitterly. She emphatically denied that her former husband was alive and begged Giuseppe to produce him.

Del Genovese was a good man to me," she said, "but he left a will, and I can't believe that he left a will in the hands of his brother. As for Lopez, I know that he has been dead many years. I did not know anything about the testament which his brother has shown the Court. I will surely fight for my rights."

How Giuseppe came into possession of the will is a mystery. Frank H. Wilson and Charles C. Gill, both of Brooklyn, are named as witnesses. Del Genovese died Jan. 22 last after completing an extensive business contract at Caracas, Venezuela. The case was adjourned to give the present holder of the will time to produce the woman's former husband. Lawyer Lewis says that his client can easily establish the justice of the claim.

## RELEASE WOMAN ARRESTED FOR RETAINING A TRUNK.

Lillian Barton Promises to Return Baggage to Nina de Aubry.

Lillian Barton, or Lillian Scofield, as she is better known, forty-two years old, of No. 129 West Forty-first street, who was locked up and later bailed out from the West Thirtieth street police station last night, a complaint of the arrest of a trunk having been made against her by Nina de Aubry, of No. 88 Schermerhorn street, Brooklyn, was discharged by Magistrate Cornell in the Jefferson Market Court today.

Mrs. Barton was quite indignant over her arrest and told the Magistrate that when Mrs. Aubry left her house on June 8, after having borrowed there for three weeks, she left her trunk behind, and has since made no effort to reclaim it. When Magistrate Cornell heard this contention of Mrs. Barton he discharged her, and told Mrs. Aubry she would have to take the matter to a civil court. Mrs. Barton agreed to send the trunk back, but Mrs. Aubry said she would insist upon examining it before it left Mrs. Barton.

Mrs. Barton was quite indignant over her arrest and told the Magistrate that when Mrs. Aubry left her house on June 8, after having borrowed there for three weeks, she left her trunk behind, and has since made no effort to reclaim it. When Magistrate Cornell heard this contention of Mrs. Barton he discharged her, and told Mrs. Aubry she would have to take the matter to a civil court. Mrs. Barton agreed to send the trunk back, but Mrs. Aubry said she would insist upon examining it before it left Mrs. Barton.

Mrs. Barton was quite indignant over her arrest and told the Magistrate that when Mrs. Aubry left her house on June 8, after having borrowed there for three weeks, she left her trunk behind, and has since made no effort to reclaim it. When Magistrate Cornell heard this contention of Mrs. Barton he discharged her, and told Mrs. Aubry she would have to take the matter to a civil court. Mrs. Barton agreed to send the trunk back, but Mrs. Aubry said she would insist upon examining it before it left Mrs. Barton.

Mrs. Barton was quite indignant over her arrest and told the Magistrate that when Mrs. Aubry left her house on June 8, after having borrowed there for three weeks, she left her trunk behind, and has since made no effort to reclaim it. When Magistrate Cornell heard this contention of Mrs. Barton he discharged her, and told Mrs. Aubry she would have to take the matter to a civil court. Mrs. Barton agreed to send the trunk back, but Mrs. Aubry said she would insist upon examining it before it left Mrs. Barton.

Mrs. Barton was quite indignant over her arrest and told the Magistrate that when Mrs. Aubry left her house on June 8, after having borrowed there for three weeks, she left her trunk behind, and has since made no effort to reclaim it. When Magistrate Cornell heard this contention of Mrs. Barton he discharged her, and told Mrs. Aubry she would have to take the matter to a civil court. Mrs. Barton agreed to send the trunk back, but Mrs. Aubry said she would insist upon examining it before it left Mrs. Barton.

Mrs. Barton was quite indignant over her arrest and told the Magistrate that when Mrs. Aubry left her house on June 8, after having borrowed there for three weeks, she left her trunk behind, and has since made no effort to reclaim it. When Magistrate Cornell heard this contention of Mrs. Barton he discharged her, and told Mrs. Aubry she would have to take the matter to a civil court. Mrs. Barton agreed to send the trunk back, but Mrs. Aubry said she would insist upon examining it before it left Mrs. Barton.

Mrs. Barton was quite indignant over her arrest and told the Magistrate that when Mrs. Aubry left her house on June 8, after having borrowed there for three weeks, she left her trunk behind, and has since made no effort to reclaim it. When Magistrate Cornell heard this contention of Mrs. Barton he discharged her, and told Mrs. Aubry she would have to take the matter to a civil court. Mrs. Barton agreed to send the trunk back, but Mrs. Aubry said she would insist upon examining it before it left Mrs. Barton.

Mrs. Barton was quite indignant over her arrest and told the Magistrate that when Mrs. Aubry left her house on June 8, after having borrowed there for three weeks, she left her trunk behind, and has since made no effort to reclaim it. When Magistrate Cornell heard this contention of Mrs. Barton he discharged her, and told Mrs. Aubry she would have to take the matter to a civil court. Mrs. Barton agreed to send the trunk back, but Mrs. Aubry said she would insist upon examining it before it left Mrs. Barton.

Mrs. Barton was quite indignant over her arrest and told the Magistrate that when Mrs. Aubry left her house on June 8, after having borrowed there for three weeks, she left her trunk behind, and has since made no effort to reclaim it. When Magistrate Cornell heard this contention of Mrs. Barton he discharged her, and told Mrs. Aubry she would have to take the matter to a civil court. Mrs. Barton agreed to send the trunk back, but Mrs. Aubry said she would insist upon examining it before it left Mrs. Barton.

Mrs. Barton was quite indignant over her arrest and told the Magistrate that when Mrs. Aubry left her house on June 8, after having borrowed there for three weeks, she left her trunk behind, and has since made no effort to reclaim it. When Magistrate Cornell heard this contention of Mrs. Barton he discharged her, and told Mrs. Aubry she would have to take the matter to a civil court. Mrs. Barton agreed to send the trunk back, but Mrs. Aubry said she would insist upon examining it before it left Mrs. Barton.

Mrs. Barton was quite indignant over her arrest and told the Magistrate that when Mrs. Aubry left her house on June 8, after having borrowed there for three weeks, she left her trunk behind, and has since made no effort to reclaim it. When Magistrate Cornell heard this contention of Mrs. Barton he discharged her, and told Mrs. Aubry she would have to take the matter to a civil court. Mrs. Barton agreed to send the trunk back, but Mrs. Aubry said she would insist upon examining it before it left Mrs. Barton.

Mrs. Barton was quite indignant over her arrest and told the Magistrate that when Mrs. Aubry left her house on June 8, after having borrowed there for three weeks, she left her trunk behind, and has since made no effort to reclaim it. When Magistrate Cornell heard this contention of Mrs. Barton he discharged her, and told Mrs. Aubry she would have to take the matter to a civil court. Mrs. Barton agreed to send the trunk back, but Mrs. Aubry said she would insist upon examining it before it left Mrs. Barton.

Mrs. Barton was quite indignant over her arrest and told the Magistrate that when Mrs. Aubry left her house on June 8, after having borrowed there for three weeks, she left her trunk behind, and has since made no effort to reclaim it. When Magistrate Cornell heard this contention of Mrs. Barton he discharged her, and told Mrs. Aubry she would have to take the matter to a civil court. Mrs. Barton agreed to send the trunk back, but Mrs. Aubry said she would insist upon examining it before it left Mrs. Barton.

## PICKS OUT MAN WHO KICKED, BEAT AND RUBBED HER

It Was Three Months Ago, but Girl Was Positive as to Identification.

Lieutenants Galvin and Miller, of the Central Office, arraigned in Centre Street Police Court today a muscular youth giving the name of Louis Euler, of No. 267 Eighth avenue, who, they charge, made a business of following women wearing expensive jewelry to their homes and robbing them. The complainant against them on this charge was Grace Carlo, a plump, pretty girl, who says she was once on the stage.

She told Magistrate Walsh that on the night of March 11 she was alone in her room at No. 267 Sixth avenue when two men opened the door and entered. One grabbed her by the throat and choked her while the other beat her over the head and face. She fell to the floor and they both kicked her until she was unconscious.

When she regained her senses, she said, she was gagged and tied to her bed with the sheets, which had been torn into strips. Her diamond earrings, her finger rings and other pieces of jewelry were missing. The earrings had been torn from her ears.

She reported the case to the police at the time, but no trace of the thieves could be found. Lieutenants Galvin and Miller, of the Central Office, picked up Euler two days ago on suspicion, found him in his possession, and traced the tickets.

They found that he had pawned jewelry, answering to the description of that which had been stolen from Grace Carlo. The young man was sent for, and Galvin and Miller took her to the Tombs yesterday evening, where they lined up fifty young prisoners, including Euler.

He hung his head and twisted his fingers, but the girl picked him out and said she was positive he was one of the men who had robbed her. In the mean time Galvin and Miller had been looking him up and learned that he had a reputation in the underworld for spotting women wearing jewelry on the street and robbing them either by making their acquaintance or forcing his way into their rooms.

Miss Carlo had scars on her face when she appeared in court to-day, which, she said, were inflicted at the time she was robbed by the shoes of her assailants. Magistrate Walsh held Euler for trial in the Court of General Sessions.

As nearly as could be learned Del Genovese met the woman in 1888. At that time she admitted she was the wife of Edward Lopez, a man who had been married shortly after, and Lopez, according to the woman, left her, saying that she was free to marry again, and that he would never return to bother her. The deserted wife did not see Lopez again until she learned that her husband had died.

She then married Del Genovese, the ceremony being recorded. The fruit of the marriage, the sixteen-year-old girl who accompanied her mother into court.

When Mrs. Del Genovese announced her intention of contesting the will, Giuseppe arose and dramatically said: "I can produce Lopez, who is still married to that man. You have no right to the property of my dead brother."

The declaration caused a stir in court. Mrs. Del Genovese was partly overcome by the exhibition of the will. After this announcement she broke down and wept bitterly. She emphatically denied that her former husband was alive and begged Giuseppe to produce him.

Del Genovese was a good man to me," she said, "but he left a will, and I can't believe that he left a will in the hands of his brother. As for Lopez, I know that he has been dead many years. I did not know anything about the testament which his brother has shown the Court. I will surely fight for my rights."

How Giuseppe came into possession of the will is a mystery. Frank H. Wilson and Charles C. Gill, both of Brooklyn, are named as witnesses. Del Genovese died Jan. 22 last after completing an extensive business contract at Caracas, Venezuela. The case was adjourned to give the present holder of the will time to produce the woman's former husband. Lawyer Lewis says that his client can easily establish the justice of the claim.

Mrs. Barton was quite indignant over her arrest and told the Magistrate that when Mrs. Aubry left her house on June 8, after having borrowed there for three weeks, she left her trunk behind, and has since made no effort to reclaim it. When Magistrate Cornell heard this contention of Mrs. Barton he discharged her, and told Mrs. Aubry she would have to take the matter to a civil court. Mrs. Barton agreed to send the trunk back, but Mrs. Aubry said she would insist upon examining it before it left Mrs. Barton.

Mrs. Barton was quite indignant over her arrest and told the Magistrate that when Mrs. Aubry left her house on June 8, after having borrowed there for three weeks, she left her trunk behind, and has since made no effort to reclaim it. When Magistrate Cornell heard this contention of Mrs. Barton he discharged her, and told Mrs. Aubry she would have to take the matter to a civil court. Mrs. Barton agreed to send the trunk back, but Mrs. Aubry said she would insist upon examining it before it left Mrs. Barton.

Mrs. Barton was quite indignant over her arrest and told the Magistrate that when Mrs. Aubry left her house on June 8, after having borrowed there for three weeks, she left her trunk behind, and has since made no effort to reclaim it. When Magistrate Cornell heard this contention of Mrs. Barton he discharged her, and told Mrs. Aubry she would have to take the matter to a civil court. Mrs. Barton agreed to send the trunk back, but Mrs. Aubry said she would insist upon examining it before it left Mrs. Barton.

Mrs. Barton was quite indignant over her arrest and told the Magistrate that when Mrs. Aubry left her house on June 8, after having borrowed there for three weeks, she left her trunk behind, and has since made no effort to reclaim it. When Magistrate Cornell heard this contention of Mrs. Barton he discharged her, and told Mrs. Aubry she would have to take the matter to a civil court. Mrs. Barton agreed to send the trunk back, but Mrs. Aubry said she would insist upon examining it before it left Mrs. Barton.

Mrs. Barton was quite indignant over her arrest and told the Magistrate that when Mrs. Aubry left her house on June 8, after having borrowed there for three weeks, she left her trunk behind, and has since made no effort to reclaim it. When Magistrate Cornell heard this contention of Mrs. Barton he discharged her, and told Mrs. Aubry she would have to take the matter to a civil court. Mrs. Barton agreed to send the trunk back, but Mrs. Aubry said she would insist upon examining it before it left Mrs. Barton.

Mrs. Barton was quite indignant over her arrest and told the Magistrate that when Mrs. Aubry left her house on June 8, after having borrowed there for three weeks, she left her trunk behind, and has since made no effort to reclaim it. When Magistrate Cornell heard this contention of Mrs. Barton he discharged her, and told Mrs. Aubry she would have to take the matter to a civil court. Mrs. Barton agreed to send the trunk back, but Mrs. Aubry said she would insist upon examining it before it left Mrs. Barton.

Mrs. Barton was quite indignant over her arrest and told the Magistrate that when Mrs. Aubry left her house on June 8, after having borrowed there for three weeks, she left her trunk behind, and has since made no effort to reclaim it. When Magistrate Cornell heard this contention of Mrs. Barton he discharged her, and told Mrs. Aubry she would have to take the matter to a civil court. Mrs. Barton agreed to send the trunk back, but Mrs. Aubry said she would insist upon examining it before it left Mrs. Barton.

Mrs. Barton was quite indignant over her arrest and told the Magistrate that when Mrs. Aubry left her house on June 8, after having borrowed there for three weeks, she left her trunk behind, and has since made no effort to reclaim it. When Magistrate Cornell heard this contention of Mrs. Barton he discharged her, and told Mrs. Aubry she would have to take the matter to a civil court. Mrs. Barton agreed to send the trunk back, but Mrs. Aubry said she would insist upon examining it before it left Mrs. Barton.

Mrs. Barton was quite indignant over her arrest and told the Magistrate that when Mrs. Aubry left her house on June 8, after having borrowed there for three weeks, she left her trunk behind, and has since made no effort to reclaim it. When Magistrate Cornell heard this contention of Mrs. Barton he discharged her, and told Mrs. Aubry she would have to take the matter to a civil court. Mrs. Barton agreed to send the trunk back, but Mrs. Aubry said she would insist upon examining it before it left Mrs. Barton.

Mrs. Barton was quite indignant over her arrest and told the Magistrate that when Mrs. Aubry left her house on June 8, after having borrowed there for three weeks, she left her trunk behind, and has since made no effort to reclaim it. When Magistrate Cornell heard this contention of Mrs. Barton he discharged her, and told Mrs. Aubry she would have to take the matter to a civil court. Mrs. Barton agreed to send the trunk back, but Mrs. Aubry said she would insist upon examining it before it left Mrs. Barton.

Mrs. Barton was quite indignant over her arrest and told the Magistrate that when Mrs. Aubry left her house on June 8, after having borrowed there for three weeks, she left her trunk behind, and has since made no effort to reclaim it. When Magistrate Cornell heard this contention of Mrs. Barton he discharged her, and told Mrs. Aubry she would have to take the matter to a civil court. Mrs. Barton agreed to send the trunk back, but Mrs. Aubry said she would insist upon examining it before it left Mrs. Barton.

Mrs. Barton was quite indignant over her arrest and told the Magistrate that when Mrs. Aubry left her house on June 8, after having borrowed there for three weeks, she left her trunk behind, and has since made no effort to reclaim it. When Magistrate Cornell heard this contention of Mrs. Barton he discharged her, and told Mrs. Aubry she would have to take the matter to a civil court. Mrs. Barton agreed to send the trunk back, but Mrs. Aubry said she would insist upon examining it before it left Mrs. Barton.

Mrs. Barton was quite indignant over her arrest and told the Magistrate that when Mrs. Aubry left her house on June 8, after having borrowed there for three weeks, she left her trunk behind, and has since made no effort to reclaim it. When Magistrate Cornell heard this contention of Mrs. Barton he discharged her, and told Mrs. Aubry she would have to take the matter to a civil court. Mrs. Barton agreed to send the trunk back, but Mrs. Aubry said she would insist upon examining it before it left Mrs. Barton.

Mrs. Barton was quite indignant over her arrest and told the Magistrate that when Mrs. Aubry left her house on June 8, after having borrowed there for three weeks, she left her trunk behind, and has since made no effort to reclaim it. When Magistrate Cornell heard this contention of Mrs. Barton he discharged her, and told Mrs. Aubry she would have to take the matter to a civil court. Mrs. Barton agreed to send the trunk back, but Mrs. Aubry said she would insist upon examining it before it left Mrs. Barton.

Mrs. Barton was quite indignant over her arrest and told the Magistrate that when Mrs. Aubry left her house on June 8, after having borrowed there for three weeks, she left her trunk behind, and has since made no effort to reclaim it. When Magistrate Cornell heard this contention of Mrs. Barton he discharged her, and told Mrs. Aubry she would have to take the matter to a civil court. Mrs. Barton agreed to send the trunk back, but Mrs. Aubry said she would insist upon examining it before it left Mrs. Barton.

Mrs. Barton was quite indignant over her arrest and told the Magistrate that when Mrs. Aubry left her house on June 8, after having borrowed there for three weeks, she left her trunk behind, and has since made no effort to reclaim it. When Magistrate Cornell heard this contention of Mrs. Barton he discharged her, and told Mrs. Aubry she would have to take the matter to a civil court. Mrs. Barton agreed to send the trunk back, but Mrs. Aubry said she would insist upon examining it before it left Mrs. Barton.

Mrs. Barton was quite indignant over her arrest and told the Magistrate that when Mrs. Aubry left her house on June 8, after having borrowed there for three weeks, she left her trunk behind, and has since made no effort to reclaim it. When Magistrate Cornell heard this contention of Mrs. Barton he discharged her, and told Mrs. Aubry she would have to take the matter to a civil court. Mrs. Barton agreed to send the trunk back, but Mrs. Aubry said she would insist upon examining it before it left Mrs. Barton.

Mrs. Barton was quite indignant over her arrest and told the Magistrate that when Mrs. Aubry left her house on June 8, after having borrowed there for three weeks, she left her trunk behind, and has since made no effort to reclaim it. When Magistrate Cornell heard this contention of Mrs. Barton he discharged her, and told Mrs. Aubry she would have to take the matter to a civil court. Mrs. Barton agreed to send the trunk back, but Mrs. Aubry said she would insist upon examining it before it left Mrs. Barton.

Mrs. Barton was quite indignant over her arrest and told the Magistrate that when Mrs. Aubry left her house on June 8, after having borrowed there for three weeks, she left her trunk behind, and has since made no effort to reclaim it. When Magistrate Cornell heard this contention of Mrs. Barton he discharged her, and told Mrs. Aubry she would have to take the matter to a civil court. Mrs. Barton agreed to send the trunk back, but Mrs. Aubry said she would insist upon examining it before it left Mrs. Barton.

Mrs. Barton was quite indignant over her arrest and told the Magistrate that when Mrs. Aubry left her house on June 8, after having borrowed there for three weeks, she left her trunk behind, and has since made no effort to reclaim it. When Magistrate Cornell heard this contention of Mrs. Barton he discharged her, and told Mrs. Aubry she would have to take the matter to a civil court. Mrs. Barton agreed to send the trunk back, but Mrs. Aubry said she would insist upon examining it before it left Mrs. Barton.

Mrs. Barton was quite indignant over her arrest and told the Magistrate that when Mrs. Aubry left her house on June 8, after having borrowed there for three weeks, she left her trunk behind, and has since made no effort to reclaim it. When Magistrate Cornell heard this contention of Mrs. Barton he discharged her, and told Mrs. Aubry she would have to take the matter to a civil court. Mrs. Barton agreed to send the trunk back, but Mrs. Aubry said she would insist upon examining it before it left Mrs. Barton.

Mrs. Barton was quite indignant over her arrest and told the Magistrate that when Mrs. Aubry left her house on June 8, after having borrowed there for three weeks, she left her trunk behind, and has since made no effort to reclaim it. When Magistrate Cornell heard this contention of Mrs. Barton he discharged her, and told Mrs. Aubry she would have to take the matter to a civil court. Mrs. Barton agreed to send the trunk back, but Mrs. Aubry said she would insist upon examining it before it left Mrs. Barton.

Mrs. Barton was quite indignant over her arrest and told the Magistrate that when Mrs. Aubry left her house on June 8, after having borrowed there for three weeks, she left her trunk behind, and has since made no effort to reclaim it. When Magistrate Cornell heard this contention of Mrs. Barton he discharged her, and told Mrs. Aubry she would have to take the matter to a civil court. Mrs. Barton agreed to send the trunk back, but Mrs. Aubry said she would insist upon examining it before it left Mrs. Barton.

## FIRE DRIVES OUT WATER-FRONT HOTEL GUESTS

Two-Alarm Blaze in South Street—40 Horses Saved by Loungers.

A blaze that threatened a hotel, caused several families to be temporarily turned out of their homes and endangered forty horses, at Nos. 151 and 153 Water street, early to-day, caused two alarms and brought out Chief Croker.

The building is a four-story brick and the first floor is occupied by L. Marous, a dealer in bricks and stones. Upstairs is the stable of A. Schulmann and a cooperage shop, with general storage room. Forty horses are kept there, being mostly the property of poor vendors. The flames started in the third floor, rear, Julius Kreun, night watchman at the Plymouth Hotel, which is at right angles with the building and faces on South street, discovered the fire and turned in an alarm from the hotel.

Life then hurried himself around the forty-six guests, and they all got out. Kreun beat on the pavement with his nightstick, and Sergeant Specht and Patrolman Kane, of the Madison street police station, were soon on the scene. The flames were burning fiercely, and the wind shifted in such a way as to endanger the small buildings at Nos. 155 Water and 161 Jefferson streets.

The police ordered all the tenants to the streets. Meanwhile a second alarm had been turned in, and Chief Croker arrived. Deputy Chief Guerin was in charge of the firemen, who succeeded in keeping the fire to the two upper floors of the building in which it started, entailing a loss of \$500.

The horses were all saved by the loungers who sleep around on the streets and wharves in warm weather. They were on hand and had led the last of the animals to safety before even the firemen arrived.

SHOT GUY; KILLED HIMSELF  
WASHINGTON, June 18.—Thomas Johnson, negro, twenty-five years old, employed as a clerk in the Department of Agriculture, early to-day shot and fatally wounded Jennie Washington, a seventeen-year-old negro girl, and then committed suicide by shooting himself through the head. Johnson's act is attributed to jealousy.

White Petticoats that were \$1.75 to \$6. Now at \$1.25, \$2, \$3 and \$4.50 each. Nightgowns that were \$1.50 to \$6. Now at \$1, \$2 and \$4.50 each. Chemises that were \$1.50 to \$2.50. Now at \$1, \$1.50 and \$2 each. Corset Covers that were \$1.75. Now at \$1.25 each. Drawers that were \$2.75. Now at \$2 each.

And there are hundreds of other items—at lower prices and larger prices, showing positive savings of from a quarter to a third on what similar garments will cost after present stocks are exhausted. The BEST OFFERINGS will be gone quickly now.

Then, here are three groups of SHIRT-WAISTS—many of which are at Half Price:

White Lawn Shirt Waists, trimmed with lace and embroidery; were \$4.50 to \$5.50. Now at \$2.75 each.

White Lawn Shirt Waists, with panels of embroidery and lace; were \$3 to \$3.75. Now at \$1.75 each.

Shirt Waists, in various styles, trimmed with lace and embroidery; were \$2 to \$2.25. Now at \$1 each.

Fourth floor, Old Building.

Fourth floor, Old Building.

Basement, Old Building.

Basement, Old Building.

Basement, Old Building.

Basement, Old Building.

Basement, Old Building.

Basement, Old Building.

Basement, Old Building.

Basement, Old Building.

Basement, Old Building.

Basement, Old Building.

Basement, Old Building.

Basement, Old Building.

Basement, Old Building.

Basement, Old Building.

Basement, Old Building.

Basement, Old Building.

Basement, Old Building.

Basement, Old Building.

Basement, Old Building.

Basement, Old Building.

Basement, Old Building.

Basement, Old Building.

Basement, Old Building.

Basement, Old Building.

Basement, Old Building.

Basement, Old Building.

## INDICTMENTS IN DODGE-MORSE CASE DISMISSED

Those Still Pending Against Abe Hummel and Others Stricken from Record.

The Dodge-Morse scandal was practically disposed of forever to-day, as far as the courts are concerned, when Justice Giegerich, sitting in the Criminal Branch of the Supreme Court, dismissed the pending indictments against Abraham Hummel, ex-justice of the Supreme Court, Edgar L. Furman, Charles F. Dodge and Benjamin Steinhardt, Hummel's partner, who died yesterday.

The indictments were dismissed at the instance of District Attorney Jerome. He appeared in court and made a brief address. He said, in asking that the two pending indictments for subornation of perjury against Hummel be dismissed, that the little lawyer had materially aided the State in a "recent murder case."

Long Branch Man Was Victim on Putnam Division Railroad.

Capt. Charles Kemp, of the Highbridge police station, has established the identity of a man who was struck and killed last night by a Putnam Division train of the New York Central Railroad on the tracks just north of Highbridge. He is probably H. S. Howland, of No. 78 North Broadway, Long Branch, N. J.

Papers and letters in his pocket bearing that address led Capt. Kemp to communicate with the Long Branch authorities. He received word to-day that H. S. Howland was in New York and that his father and other relatives were on their way here to identify the body. The description sent from Long Branch of H. S. Howland tallies with that of the man who was killed.

DUCHESS OF ROXBURGHE GETS BACK JEWEL CASE.

LONDON, June 18.—The jewel case lost by the Dowager Duchess of Roxburghe during a railway journey from London to Bournemouth, June 15, was found intact in the car where it had been mislaid.

While Mr. Jerome had made no promise to Hummel, he said, it was usual to show some appreciation for such services in the case of men under indictment.

Mr. Hummel, the District Attorney thought, was punished severely enough in going to prison. He will also be discharged from further practice in this State.

Concerning the indictment against ex-Justice Furman, Mr. Jerome spoke of his "hitherto spotless reputation and the many important posts he has held at the bar of New York." He added that the indictment was only for misdemeanor and that he would recommend its dismissal.

As for the indictment against Charles F. Dodge, Mr. Jerome thought it unquestionably should be dismissed because of Dodge's aid in convicting Hummel.

The recommendation for the dismissal of the indictment against the late Benjamin Steinhardt was merely a matter of form. The only indictment Mr. Jerome allowed to stand was one against Edward J. Bracken, the private detective, who has not yet been arrested.

TRAIN KILLED H. S. HOWLAND

Long Branch Man Was Victim on Putnam Division Railroad.

Capt. Charles Kemp, of the Highbridge police station, has established the identity of a man who was struck and killed last night by a Putnam Division train of the New York Central Railroad on the tracks just north of Highbridge. He is probably H. S. Howland, of No. 78 North Broadway, Long Branch, N. J.

Papers and letters in his pocket bearing that address led Capt. Kemp to communicate with the Long Branch authorities. He received word to-day that H. S. Howland was in New York and that his father and other relatives were on their way here to identify the body. The description sent from Long Branch of H. S. Howland tallies with that of the man who was killed.

DUCHESS OF ROXBURGHE GETS BACK JEWEL CASE